



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,315	11/10/2003	Sachin Doshi	884.A59US1	4452
21186	7590	08/07/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			PARK, IL WOO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2182	

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/705,315	DOSHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ilwoo Park	2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/17/2006 has been entered.
2. Claims 1, 4, 11, 17, 19, 25, and 28 are amended in response to the last office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-6, 11-13, 17-23, 28, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Scifres et al. [US 2003/0225905 A1].

As for claim 1, Scifres et al teach a method, comprising:
controlling a data flow associated with at least one of a selected number of ports [subset of identified usage devices 48 in paragraph 0032 and fig. 3] having a first actual value above [flow volume 32 exceeding its corresponding volume limit 34 paragraph 0032 and

Art Unit: 2182

fig. 3] a determined average shared resource usage value [see determined volume limit 34 according to an average flow volume and a usage pattern for the flows 26 in paragraph 0049] associated with the selected number of ports sharing a resource, wherein the selected number of ports each use [subset of identified usage devices 48 exceeding its corresponding volume limit 34 paragraph 0032 in paragraph 0032 and fig. 3] an amount of the resource greater than a guaranteed minimum amount [usage restricted above the volume limit 34 in paragraphs 0050, 0065 and fig. 6A] of the resource.

5. As for claim 2, Scifres et al teach determining an average shared resource usage value [determining the volume limit in paragraph 0049].

6. As for claim 3, Scifres et al teach a data flow being associated with a restricted flow usage level, which is below the maximum flow usage level [see page 8, claim 1 and paragraph 0048]. Therefore, the control step is removed once a portion of the flow rate is allocated according to the selected restriction rules.

7. As for claim 4, Scifres et al teach selecting the selected number of ports by locating at least one port included in a plurality of ports using the amount of the resource greater than the guaranteed minimum amount [identifying the subset of usage devices having flows exceeding the volume limit in paragraph 0049]; determining a cumulative shared usage value based on the selected number of ports; and determining the determined average shared usage value by dividing the cumulative shared usage value by the selected number of ports [equation (3) in paragraph 0049].

8. As for claim 5, Scifres et al teach adjusting the selected number of ports to provide a scaled selected number of ports based on a port speed associated with a first port and

Art Unit: 2182

a port speed associated with a second port, wherein the first port and the second port are included in the selected number of ports [usage limit selected from sets of volume limit and rate limit in paragraph 0012].

9. As for claim 6, Scifres et al teach repeatedly determining the determined average shared resource usage value associated with the selected number of ports [repeating said computing, comparing, identifying, and associating steps in page 8, claims 1, 4, and 5].

10. As for claim 11, Scifres et al teach a method for controlling a data flow. Accordingly, Scifres et al also teach an article comprising a machine-accessible medium having associated data, wherein the data, when accessed, results in a machine performing these steps. Therefore, the present claim is rejected under the same rationale.

11. As for claims 12, 13, 17, and 18, Scifres et al also teach an article comprising a machine-accessible medium having associated data, wherein the data, when accessed, results in a machine performing these steps. Therefore, the present claim is rejected under the same rationale.

12. As for claim 19, Scifres et al teach a method for controlling a data flow associated with at least one of a selected number of ports. Accordingly, Scifres et al also teach an apparatus for implementing the cited method. Therefore, the present claim is rejected under the same rationale.

13. As for claims 20-22, Scifres et al also teach an apparatus for implementing the cited method. Therefore, the present claim is rejected under the same rationale.

14. As for claim 23, Scifres et al teach a network processor [processing agent 22 in fig. 3].

15. As for claim 28, Scifres et al teach a method for controlling a data flow associated with at least one of a selected number of ports. Accordingly, Scifres et al also teach a system for implementing the cited method. Therefore, the present claim is rejected under the same rationale.

16. As for claim 32, Scifres et al teach a communications medium coupled to the connector [fig. 1].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 7-10, 14-16, 25-27, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scifres et al. [US 2003/0225905 A1] in view of Sato [US 6,009,078] in further view of Ruutu et al. [US 2003/0123392 A1].

As for claims 7 and 8, Scifres et al teach controlling a data flow [see Abstract, "flow allocation"] associated with at least one of the selected number of ports. The reference also teaches "repeatedly" performing the "computing, comparing, identifying, and associating steps" [see Page 8, claim 5]. However, Scifres et al do not specify a dynamic threshold value or setting this value as a sum of the determined average shared resource usage value and a delta value. Regarding this limitation, Ruutu et al. teaches a dynamic

Art Unit: 2182

sharing mechanism [see Abstract] and sets a nominal capacity to each data flow and additional capacity is shifted from a first flow to a second flow. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the cited disclosures in order to reduce the number of packet drops during congestion and improving network performance, as taught by Ruutu et al.

19. As for claim 9, Scifres et al teach determining a value according to speed [see Page 5, paragraph 0049, "rate"] and overall usage value [see "usage pattern"]. However, this reference does not specify a delta value. Ruutu et al teach setting a nominal capacity to each data flow and shifting an additional capacity from a first flow to a second flow when its nominal capacity has been exceeded. This implements a dynamic buffer-sharing mechanism [see Abstract].

20. As for claim 10, Scifres et al do not teach the resource as a memory. Ruutu et al teach a memory sharing mechanism [see Abstract]. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the cited disclosures for the reasons stated above.

21. As for claims 14-16, the combination of references also teaches an article comprising a machine-accessible medium having associated data, wherein the data, when accessed, results in a machine performing these steps. Therefore, the present claims are rejected under the same rationale.

22. Regarding claim 25, Scifres et al teaches controlling a data flow [see Abstract, "flow allocation"] associated with a plurality of ports having reservation module coupled to the plurality of port to provide a minimum resource per port and to share a remaining resource among the plurality of ports using more than the minimum resource [e.g., fig.

Art Unit: 2182

8B], an average determination module to determine [see determined volume limit 34 according to an average flow volume and a usage pattern for the flows 26 in paragraph 0049] a determined average shared resource usage value greater [flow volume 32 exceeding its corresponding volume limit 34 paragraph 0032 and fig. 3] than the minimum resource, and controlling module to control a data flow associated with at least one [subset of identified usage devices 48 in paragraph 0032 and fig. 3] of the plurality of ports having an actual usage value above the determined average shared resource usage value [usage devices having flows exceeding the volume limit in paragraph 0049]. However, Scifres et al do not teach the resource is a memory having a transmit queue storage and a plurality of ports coupled to it. Ruutu et al teach a buffer [memory] sharing mechanism [see Abstract]. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the cited disclosures for the reasons stated above.

23. As for claims 26-27, the combination of references also teaches the apparatus for implementing the method. Therefore, the present claims are rejected under the same rationale.

24. As for claims 30-31, the combination of references also teaches the system for implementing the method. Therefore, the present claims are rejected under the same rationale.

25. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scifres et al. [US 2003/0225905 A1] in view of Liang [US 5,933,427 A].

As for claim 24, the Scifres et al reference teaches a network switch [paragraph 0040]; however, the Scifres et al reference does not explicitly teach the network switch is

Art Unit: 2182

a Layer 2 Ethernet switch. However, Liang teaches a Layer 2 Ethernet switch [see col. 2, lines 9-10]. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the cited combination of disclosures in order to implement a common switch for a ubiquitous Ethernet LAN, as taught by Liang.

26. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scifres et al. [US 2003/0225905 A1] in view of Roberts [US 6,104,712 A].

As for claim 29, Scifres et al. reference does not teach an omni directional antenna to receive information included in the data flow. Regarding this limitation, Roberts teaches data flow received using omni directional antennas [see Figure 2]. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the cited disclosures in order to implement wireless networks, as taught by Roberts.

Response to Arguments


27. Applicant's arguments filed 5/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues in substance that none of the cited reference teaches the selected number of ports each use an amount of the resource greater than a guaranteed minimum amount of the resource. For this point, Scifres et al teach a selected number of ports [subset of identified usage devices 48 exceeding its corresponding volume limit 34 paragraph 0032 in paragraph 0032 and fig. 3; grouping the usage devices into subsets in which each member of the subset has exceeded the usage limit in paragraph 0060] an amount of the resource greater than a guaranteed minimum amount [usage restricted above the volume limit 34 in paragraphs 0050, 0065 and fig. 6A].

Art Unit: 2182

Conclusion

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ilwoo Park whose telephone number is (571) 272-4155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Huynh can be reached on (571) 272-4147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**ILWOO PARK
PRIMARY EXAMINER**



Ilwoo Park

August 1, 2006